2011 12 19 RESPONSE TO NEW INFORMATION

Hi Linda,

I've attached the following reply.

The information you sent is consistent with what I have seen in the last several years. All this information was taken into consideration when I composed the information that I sent earlier. I shall address several points.

1. **First Figure 1: "As a consequence, atmospheric CO2 is at its highest level in 15 to 20 million years."**
2. **First Figure 2: Human activity has upset the CO2 emission/absorption balance.**
3. **Second Figures 1 and 2: The best maximum projection of temperature increase by 2100 is 4°C.**
4. **Also Second Figure 1: A doubling of CO2 will double the increase in temperature.**
5. **Figure 3: "There are many factors which impact short-term global temperatures."**

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO XXXXXXXXXXX OOOOOOOOOO

1. "As a consequence, atmospheric CO2 is at its highest level in 15 to 20 million years."

Actually the only time CO2 was this low was 300 and 450 million years ago.
http://www.iceagenow.com/An_Engineers_Critique_of_Global_Warming_Science.htm

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO XXXXXXXXXXX OOOOOOOOOO

2. First Figure 2: Human activity has upset the CO2 emission/absorption balance.

Figure 2, when extended back to 1850, is similar. The proportion of AGHG taken up by natural processes is a constant 55%. So no matter how much we emit, 2 or 35 billion tons, 55% is absorbed. This, of course, does not make any claim of a relationship to global warming.
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2009/11/10/bombshell-from-bristol-is-the-airborne-fraction-of-anthropogenic-co2-emissions-increasing-study-says-no/

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO XXXXXXXXXXX OOOOOOOOOO

3. Second Figures 1 and 2: The best maximum projection of temperature increase by 2100 is 4°C.

The 4°C rise is the same value I used to compute the effect of ceasing all human CO2 emissions. If all is eliminated by 2100, then decrease is 0.000058C or six 100 thousandths of a degree. I provided the following link to the same data. It is important to note that almost all of the projected global warming is from sources other than AGHG.
http://www.appinsys.com/GlobalWarming/GW_TemperatureProjections.htm

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO XXXXXXXXXXX OOOOOOOOOO

4. Also Second Figure 1: A doubling of CO2 will double the increase in temperature.

Laboratory experiments show that when CO2 reaches a concentration of 280ppm, the amount of infrared radiation it can absorb diminishes to near zero. In fact CO2 absorbs almost all of it within 10 meters of the ground. So as concentration increases it has little or no warming effect.
http://petesplace-peter.blogspot.com/2007/06/more-on-why-carbon-dioxide-is-not.html
Math: http://www.john-daly.com/artifact.htm

OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO XXXXXXXXXXX OOOOOOOOOO

5. Figure 3: "There are many factors which impact short-term global temperatures."

CO2 is not one of the factors as shown by this graph showing temperature change precedes CO2 change.
http://icecap.us/images/uploads/FlaticecoreCO2.pdf

Even on a longer scale, global temperature changes precede CO2 changes.
http://icecap.us/images/uploads/200705-03AusIMMcorrected.pdf

In my attached file, Point D identified correlation between CO2 and natural phenomena as well as longer term graphs.

> "According to the **OFFICIAL** global climate data centers: From 1895/7 to 2007 there is 0.85 correlation of global temperature with oceanic oscillations; 0.57 with solar intensity fluctuations; and 0.43 with CO2 concentration. From 1987 to 2007 there is a **0.02 correlation with CO2** concentration."
> http://wattsupwiththat.com/2008/01/25/warming-trend-pdo-and-solar-correlate-better-than-co2/

The rate of increase in temperature between 1979 and 2008 exceeds the rate of increase in CO2, contrary to projections by IPCC.
http://wattsupwiththat.com/2008/12/17/the-co2-temperature-link/

Since 1998 global temperature has declined while CO2 has increased. Is the decline in global temperature the result of increased CO2?